arXiv:1403.6093v1 [q-fin.PM] 24 Mar 2014

Reward-risk momentum strategies using classical tempered stable distribution

Jaehyung Choi[a,*], Aaron Kim[b], Ivan Mitov[c]

[a] *Department of Physics and Astronomy, SUNY, Stony Brook, NY 11794, USA*
[b] *College of Business, SUNY, Stony Brook, NY 11794, USA*
[c] *FinAnalytica Inc., New York, NY 10017, USA*

Abstract

We implement momentum strategies based on reward-risk measures as ranking criteria using classical tempered stable distribution. The performance and risk characteristics of the portfolios are obtained in various asset classes and markets. The reward-risk momentum strategies outperform the traditional momentum strategy with lower volatility level regardless of asset class and market. Additionally, the alternative portfolios are not only less riskier in risk measures such as VaR, CVaR, and maximum drawdown but also characterized by thinner downside tails. Similar patterns in performance and risk profiles are also found at the level of each ranking basket in the alternative portfolios. Larger factor-neutral returns achieved by the reward-risk momentum strategies are statistically significant and the large portions of the performance are not explained by the Fama-French three-factor model.

Keywords: momentum strategy, reward-risk measure, classical tempered stable distribution

1. Introduction

Since its discovery [1], price momentum, one of the most well-known market anomalies, has attracted attention from academia and industry. Many evidence for the price momentum have been found in various asset classes and markets [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. Unfortunately, the origin of the price momentum is still mysterious although diverse explanations and interpretations on the anomaly have been suggested. Those approaches include lead-lag effect or auto-/cross-sectional correlation [8, 9], over-/under-reaction of investors to the news [10, 11, 12, 13], sector momentum [14], and transaction cost [15]. However, there is no integrated framework to explain the market anomaly yet.

*Correspondence address: Department of Physics and Astronomy, SUNY, Stony Brook, NY 11794, USA. Fax:+1-631-632-8176.

Email addresses: jaehyung.choi@stonybrook.edu (Jaehyung Choi), aaron.kim@stonybrook.edu (Aaron Kim), ivan.mitov@finanalytica.com (Ivan Mitov)

The practitioners are also interested in the momentum strategy for developing profitable trading strategies. The anomaly is based on the belief that the future direction of a financial asset price is predictable with past price history. When an asset price forms a trend, it tends to keep the trend, i.e. past winners are likely to outperform past losers in the future. Exploiting the prediction based on the momentum anomaly, it is obvious for investors, who want to implement the momentum strategy, to buy the past winners and short-sell the past losers. However, it is not easy to define and filter the price trend from noisy data in practice. Moreover, the risk of losing money always exists if the naive strategy is implemented without any deep understanding in the source of the price momentum.

In these senses, more profound analysis on the price momentum is indispensable and finding potential momentum factors is an important task to both academics and practitioners. One easy approach to demystifying the origin and finding the lucrative trading strategies is implementing the momentum strategies employing alternative stock selection rules which are potential momentum driving factors. The several factors considered in the literature are expected return by time series model [6], trading volume [16], liquidity [17, 18, 19, 20], 52-week high price [21, 22], physical momentum [23], and reward-risk measures [24].

Among the papers on the alternative stock selection rules, the work by Rachev et al. [24] focused on various reward-risk measures as the momentum ranking criteria. Their momentum portfolios were constructed by long positions on less riskier assets and short positions on much riskier assets. In the S&P 500 universe from 1996 to 2003, these alternative portfolios achieved the less riskier performance than the traditional momentum strategy. Additionally, it was found that the momentum winner groups with the better reward-risk measures in the past are subjected to lower ex-post risks than the loser groups.

In this paper, we extend the approach based on the reward-risk measures suggested by Rachev et al. [24] to many different directions. First of all, the reward-risk measure based momentum portfolios are constructed in diverse asset classes including currency markets, commodity markets, global stock benchmark indices, South Korea KOSPI 200 universe, SPDR U.S. sector ETFs, and S&P 500 universe. Secondly, more robust tests by using a different time horizon and removing survivor bias with the component-change log are performed in the S&P 500 universe. Finally, the Fama-French factor analysis on the reward-risk portfolios is conducted. The structure of this paper is followings: In next section, we briefly cover a risk model and reward-risk measures used as stock selection rules for momentum-style portfolio construction. In section 3, datasets and methodology are introduced. The performance and risk measures of the strategies are given in section 4. The Fama-French factor analysis is conducted in section 5. We close the paper in section 6.

2. Risk model and reward-risk measures

2.1. Risk model

It is important to decide a risk model for the calculation of reward-risk measures. Considering the distributional properties of a financial asset price such as autocorrelation and volatility clustering, the ARMA(1,1)-GARCH(1,1) model is chosen. Additionally, we assume that the innovation of the model is generated from classical tempered stable (CTS) distribution [25] in order to model skewness and kurtosis. The ARMA-GARCH-CTS model is proposed by Kim et al. [26] and this paper follows it.

An infinitely divisible random variable X is said to follow the CTS distribution, $X \sim \mathrm{CTS}(\alpha, C_+, C_-, \lambda_+, \lambda_-, m)$ if its Levy triplet (σ^2, ν, γ) satisfies following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= 0 \\ \nu(dx) &= (C_+ e^{-\lambda_+ x}\mathbb{I}_{x>0} + C_- e^{-\lambda_- |x|}\mathbb{I}_{x<0})\frac{dx}{|x|^{\alpha+1}} \\ \gamma &= m - \int_{|x|>1} x\nu(dx) \end{aligned}$$

where $C_+, C_-, \lambda_+, \lambda_-$ are all positive, $\alpha \in (0, 2)$, and $m \in \mathbb{R}$. From the viewpoint of risk management, important CTS parameters are α and λ_-. The tail index α tells how fat both tails are and the lager tail index is achieved by the thinner tail. The downside tail is controlled by λ_-. Similar to the tail index α, the thinner downside tail is described by the larger λ_- parameter.

2.2. Reward-risk measures

2.2.1. Sharpe ratio

The Sharpe ratio is the ratio of expected excessive return to standard deviation for excessive return [27], i.e. it is a reward per deviation. It is defined with

$$\mathrm{SR}(r) = \frac{E(r - r_f)}{\sigma(r - r_f)}$$

where r_f is a risk-free rate. A portfolio with higher Sharpe ratio is considered the better portfolio than a portfolio with lower Sharpe ratio. Additionally, the portfolio with the highest Sharpe ratio in Markowitz framework is the tangency portfolio [28].

2.2.2. Conditional Value-at-Risk

In order to define conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR), Vale-at-Risk (VaR) needs to be defined. The VaR is represented with

$$\mathrm{VaR}_{(1-\alpha)100\%} = -\inf\{l | P(r > l) \leq 1 - \alpha\}$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1$.

The CVaR, also known as average Value-at-Risk (AVaR), is the expected loss worse than the VaR [29, 30]. The CVaR is defined by

$$\mathrm{CVaR}_{(1-\alpha)100\%}(r) = \mathrm{ETL}_{\alpha 100\%}(r) = \frac{1}{\alpha}\int_0^{\alpha} \mathrm{VaR}_{(1-\beta)100\%} d\beta$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1$. When severe losses hit a given VaR level, the CVaR tells how seriously bad in average those losses are, i.e. it is the average loss of the extreme losses. For continuous distributions, it is identical to the extreme tail loss (ETL).

An advantage of CVaR over VaR is the coherency of the risk measure [30, 31, 32]. The definition of the coherent risk measure is given in the original literatures on the coherent risk measures [30, 31, 32]. Another advantage is that the CVaR encodes more information on the downside tail. For example, even if the VaR levels of two different portfolios are same, one with the fatter tail exhibits the larger CVaR.

2.2.3. Stable tail adjusted return ratio

The Sharpe ratio considers deviations along downside and upside directions. Since the deviation in the upward direction is not an actual risk, much attention on the downslide risk should be paid. The stable tail adjusted return ratio (STARR) is introduced by Martin et al. [33] in order to distinguish the risk from the deviation. The standard deviation in the denominator of the Sharpe ratio definition is replaced with the CVaR. The STARR is defined by

$$\mathrm{STARR}_{(1-\alpha)100\%} = \frac{E(r - r_f)}{\mathrm{CVaR}_{(1-\alpha)100\%}(r - r_f)}$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1$. In this paper, the linearized version of STARR is used in the paper and the linearized STARR is defined by

$$\mathrm{STARR}_{(1-\alpha)100\%} = E(r - r_f) - \mathrm{CVaR}_{(1-\alpha)100\%}(r - r_f).$$

Since larger CVaR is achieved by riskier assets, the STARR for riskier assets becomes smaller. Meanwhile, less riskier, larger STARR.

2.2.4. Rachev ratio

The return distribution of financial assets has two tails, i.e. downside and upside tails. The upper tails are favorable but the lower tails are undesirable. The Rachev ratio (R-ratio) is the ratio of the expected upward tail gain to the expected downside tail loss. It is defined by

$$\mathrm{RR}(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{\mathrm{CVaR}_{(1-\alpha)100\%}(r_f - r)}{\mathrm{CVaR}_{(1-\beta)100\%}(r - r_f)}$$

where $0 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq 1$. The higher R-ratio is more preferred.

2.2.5. Classification of the reward-risk measures

These reward-risk measures can be categorized into two classes. The first class includes ratio-based measures such as R-ratio and Sharpe ratio. With the ratio measures, the reward is scaled by the risk. The second class is risk-based measures. The CVaR is one of the measures in this category and the linearized STARR is also a member in the second group.

3. Dataset and methodology

3.1. Dataset

Various asset classes and markets are employed in order to conduct robust tests on the profitability of the reward-risk momentum strategies. The datasets consist of currency markets, commodity markets, global stock benchmark indices, South Korea KOSPI 200 universe, SPDR U.S. sector ETFs, and U.S. S&P 500 universe.

3.1.1. Currency markets

The historical currency prices are downloaded from Bloomberg and the length of the covered period is 20 years from January 1993 to December 2012. The currency rates are spot prices in U.S. dollar and obtained with respect to Eastern Standard Timezone. The instruments are followings: ARSUSD (Argentina), AUDUSD (Australia), BRLUSD (Brazil), CADUSD (Canada), CHFUSD (Swiss), CLPUSD (Chile), CNYUSD (China), COPUSD (Columbia), CZKUSD (Czech), DEMUSD (German), DKKUSD (Denmark), EGPUSD (Egypt), EURUSD (Euro), GBPUSD (U.K.), GHSUSD (Ghana), HKDUSD (Hong Kong), HUFUSD (Hungary), IDRUSD (Indonesia), ILSUSD (Israel), INRUSD (India), ISKUSD (Iceland), JPYUSD (Japan), KESUSD (Kenya), KRWUSD (South Korea), MXNUSD (Mexico), MYRUSD (Malaysia), NGNUSD (Nigeria), NOKUSD (Norway), NZDUSD (New Zealand), PENUSD(Peru), PHPUSD (Philippines), PLNUSD (Poland), RUBUSD (Russia), SARUSD (Saudi), SEKUSD (Sweden), SGDUSD (Singapore), THBUSD (Thai), TRYUSD (Turkey), TWDUSD (Taiwan), VEFUSD (Venezuela), XAFUSD (Central Africa), and ZARUSD (South Africa).

3.1.2. Commodity markets

The commodity price information between January 1993 and December 2012 is collected from Bloomberg. The historical price of a generic future contract is obtained. The whole momentum universe includes following tickers: BO (Soybean Oil: CBT), C (Corn: CBT), CC (Cocoa: NYB), CL (WTI: NYM), CO (Brent:N YM), COA (Coal: NYM), CT (Cotton: NYB), DA (Milk: CME), DL (Ethanol: CBT), FC (Feeder Cattle: CME), GC (Gold: CMX), HG (Copper: CMX), HO (Heating Oil: NYM), HU(Gasoline: NYM) JO (Orange Juice: NYB), KC (Coffee: NYB), LA (Aluminium Primary: LME), LC (Live Cattle: CME), LCO (Cobalt: LME), LH (Lean Hogs: CME), LL (Lead: LME), LN (Nickel: LME), LT (Tin: LME), LX (Zinc: LME), LY (Aluminium Alloy:

LME), MOL (Molybden: LME), NG (Natural Gas: NYM), O (Oat: CBT), OR (Rubber: SGX), PA (Palladium: NYM), PB (Pork Belly: CME), PGP (Polypropylen: NYM), PL (Platinum: NYM), PN (Propane: NYM), QS (Gas Oil: ICE), RR (Rice: CBT), S (Soybean: CBT), SB (Sugar: NYB), SI (Silver: CMX), SM (Soybean Meal: CBT), TO (Dubai: NYM), W (Wheat: CBT), and XB (RBOB Gasoline: NYM).

3.1.3. Global stock benchmark indices

The daily data of global stock benchmark indices are downloaded from Bloomberg. The time horizon covers the period from January 1993 to December 2012. The indices are converted to dollar values and the considered index tickers are AEX (Netherland), AS51 (Australia), BEL20 (Belgium), CAC 40 (France), CCMP (U.S. NASDAQ), DAX (German), FBMKLCI (Malaysia), FSSTI (Singapore), FTSEMIB-MIB30 (Italy), HSI (Hong Kong), IBEX (Spain), IBOV (Brazil), IGBC (Columbia), IGBVL (Peru), INDU (U.S. Dow Jones), IPSA (Chile), JCI (Indonesia), KOSPI (South Korea), MERVAL (Argentina), MEXBOL (Mexico), NKY (Japan), NZSE50FG (New Zealand), OMX (Sweden), PCOMP (Philiphine), PSI20 (Portuguese), RTSI$ (Russia), SENSEX (India), SET (Thailand), SHCOMP (China), SMI (Swiss), SPTSX (Canada), SPX (U.S. S&P 500), SX5E (Euro), TWSE (Taiwan), UKX (U.K.), and VNINDEX(Vietnam).

3.1.4. South Korea equity market: KOSPI 200

The price history and component-change log are obtained from Korea Exchange. The market universe for the momentum strategy consists of the recent 10-year (2003–2012) components of the KOSPI 200 which is one of main benchmark indices in Korean stock markets.

3.1.5. U.S. equity market: SPDR sector ETFs

The data for SPDR U.S. sector ETFs are collected from Bloomberg. Among various sector ETFs, SPDR sector ETFs are chosen because the same length of historical price is available for all industry sectors. The time horizon is the period between January 1999 and December 2012. The ETF universe includes XLB (Materials), XLE (Energy), XLF (Financial), XLI (Industrial), XLK (Technology), XLP (Consumer Staples), XLU (Utilities), XLV (Health Care), and XLY (Consumer Discretionary).

3.1.6. U.S. equity market: S&P 500

The price data and component-change log for S&P 500 components are downloaded from Bloomberg. The time span covers from January 2003 to December 2012.

3.2. Methodology

The portfolio construction for this study is identical to the traditional momentum portfolio construction in Jegadeesh and Titman [1]. The only difference is the usage of alternative ranking criteria for the formation of momentum

ranking groups. For comparison, the first criterion is cumulative return over a ranking period. Other stock selection rules used for portfolio construction are the reward-risk measures introduced in the previous section: Sharpe ratio, CVaR, STARR, and R-ratio. Among these reward-risk measures, Sharpe ratio, STARR, and R-ratio are already used in Rachev et al. [24] and CVaR is newly adopted in this paper.

Given a ranking rule calculated from the past six months of estimation period, assets are sorted from the highest risk to the lowest risk and grouped into several baskets. In this paper, the size of the groups is 3 except for the KOSPI 200 and S&P 500 universes which use 10 different ranking groups. Assets with the highest risk form a loser basket and the safest assets are assigned to a winner basket. Momentum return is the return difference between the winner and loser quantiles after a holding period. The six months of holding period are used in this study. In every six months, the new portfolio is constructed and maintained until the end of the holding period, i.e. it is a non-overlapping portfolio.

The price data are converted into summary data which contain the reward-risk measures and cumulative returns over the periods. Some summary results for several instruments in certain periods are ignored if enough numbers of data points in the period are not given. The minimum number of the data in the period is 21 days corresponding to the trading dates in one month. This ignorance is reasonable for the case that some instruments could have few data points during the period. In this case, it is impossible to estimate the parameters of the CTS distribution by using maximum likelihood estimation with very small numbers of data points. The Sharpe ratio, VaR, CVaR, STARR, and R-ratio are calculated in daily scale. The maximum drawdown is obtained from the entire history of the portfolio performance.

4. Results

4.1. Currency markets

According to the summary statistics of the strategies found in Table 1, the R-ratio based strategies in the currency universe outperform the traditional momentum strategy which obtains the monthly return of 0.33% and the standard deviation of 2.33%. In particular, the R-ratio(50%, 9X%)-based portfolios achieve monthly 0.44%–0.52%. The standard deviations of these portfolios are about 20% smaller than that of the original momentum strategy. In addition to that, the average monthly returns of the R-ratio(9X%,9X%) portfolios are in the range between 0.31% and 0.36%. The volatility levels of these strategies are also 40% lower than that of the cumulative return portfolio. Other reward-risk measures such as Sharpe ratio, CVaRs, and STARR ratios provide the portfolios underperforming the traditional trend-following strategy and these portfolios except for the Sharpe ratio based strategy are not less volatile.

With the R-ratio(50%,9X%) criteria, the momentum of each ranking basket becomes stronger. The winner groups of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) portfolios outperform that of the benchmark strategy. Additionally, they are the best winner

groups among all the reward-risk momentum portfolios. Opposite to the winner baskets, the loser baskets of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies are the worst performers among all the selection rules including the cumulative return. The lagging in the short basket enables the strategies beat the traditional momentum strategy. The short baskets of the R-ratio(9X%,9X%) portfolios show substantial downside momentum but the opposite baskets are not as strong as the winner portfolio of the cumulative return based strategy. The pattern of skewness also explains why the momentum by the alternative ranking rules tends to be stronger. For all the reward-risk momentum portfolios, the long (short) baskets exhibit larger (smaller) skewness than the cumulative return strategy does.

The dominant performance of the reward-risk strategies is achieved by taking less risk. In Table 2, it is obvious that every R-ratio strategies exhibit lower 95% VaR and CVaR levels. Another remarkable characteristic of the reward-risk portfolios is that the maximum drawdowns of 10.96%–14.83% are significantly smaller than 26.90% by the cumulative return portfolio. Moreover, the top 3 largest Sharpe ratios are achieved by the R-ratio(50%,X%) strategies. Besides the R-ratio strategies, the highest Sharpe ratio and lowest maximum drawdown are obtained by the Sharpe ratio momentum strategy. The reward-risk measures of any other ranking criteria are worse than those of the traditional momentum. The R-ratio(50%,95%) and R-ratio(50%,90%) strategies are characterized by larger CTS tail index α values which control the both tails simultaneously. Most of the other reward-risk strategies generally have larger λ_- parameters than the benchmark strategy.

With the VaR and CVaR levels of each ranking basket, the selection rules are categorized into two groups. The first class of the reward-risk measures are characterized by higher (lower) VaR and CVaR levels for the winner (loser) group. The R-ratios and Sharpe ratio are included in this class. The second class is opposite to the first class, i.e. the winner (loser) group is less (much) riskier than that of the cumulative return strategy. The second class consists of the CVaR and the STARR criteria. The same classification is also applied to the CTS parameters. For the criteria in the first class, the λ_- values of the winners are greater than the loser groups. In particular, for the R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies, the λ_- parameters of the long (short) position are larger (smaller) than that of the traditional momentum winner. This explain why the winner (loser) groups of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) portfolios outperform (underperform) the momentum winner (loser). For the second class, the situation is opposite to the first class. The downside tail indices of the winner portfolios are below the levels of the downside tail indices for the loser. Additionally, the smaller λ_- for the winners and larger λ_- for the losers are found. It is the reason why these strategies are not as good as the strategies by the selection rules in the first class strategies or the cumulative return portfolio.

4.2. Commodity markets

Similar to the currency market, it is found that the reward-risk portfolios in commodity markets also beat the cumulative return based strategy. According

to Table 3, the alternative momentum strategies in the commodity markets exhibit negative average returns regardless of ranking criterion and outperform the traditional trend-following strategy with the monthly return of -0.79%. Those strategies are also less volatile with smaller standard deviation than the benchmark strategy with the volatility of 5.59%. The R-ratio strategies generate the larger average returns of -0.33%– -0.06% and the smaller standard deviations in the range of 3.99%–4.31%. In particular, the R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies achieve the best performance among the R-ratio criteria. The next best portfolios are the Sharpe ratio and CVaR(90%) strategies with monthly -0.22% and -0.26%, respectively.

In the commodity markets, the reward-risk measures are good at filtering the momentum signal. The behaviors of the winner and loser groups are similar to the case in the currency universe. All winner groups in the alternative ranking rules are followed by the winner basket of the traditional momentum portfolio in performance. The best winner performer is the R-ratio(50%,90%) portfolio with monthly 0.72%. The CVaR(99%) and Sharpe ratio criteria provide the next best winner baskets with monthly 0.66% and 0.61%. These long positions of the alternative strategies are at the lower volatility levels than that of the cumulative return strategy. Additionally, all the loser groups underperform the loser group of the cumulative return criterion. The poor performance in short position is desirable for increasing the profitability of the momentum portfolio.

The risk profiles of these reward-risk strategies are more impressive. As seen in Table 4, the maximum drawdowns of the strategies are in the range of 52.20–71.68%, substantially smaller than that of the traditional trend-following strategy, 85.75%. The 95% VaRs and CVaRs by the reward-risk strategies are also below the 95% VaR and CVaR levels of the original momentum portfolio. Moreover, the Sharpe ratios of the alternative strategies, except for the STARR(90%) strategy, are larger than that of cumulative return strategy. The different patterns in the risk characteristics are also observed as it is found in the currency markets. The CVaR and STARR strategies exhibit larger λ_- values than the momentum strategy. Meanwhile, with the R-ratio and Sharpe ratio, the λ_- values of the portfolios are smaller than that of the benchmark strategy except for some R-ratio portfolios.

The risk patterns of the long/short positions also show the superiority of the alternative reward-risk strategies. The smaller VaR and CVaR levels are achieved by the winner groups of these strategies. Since the long baskets of the reward-risk strategies outperform that of the traditional momentum, the lower VaR and CVaR levels of the winner groups impose that these groups generate the more profits by accepting the lower risks. The Sharpe ratios and maximum drawdowns of the long baskets are superior to the reward-risk measures of the winner basket by the cumulative return selection rule. Other ranking portfolios feature lower VaR and CVaR levels for the winner groups but larger risk measures for the loser groups. The lower risk acceptance of the long positions is also cross-checked by the higher λ_- values than that of the long position for the momentum portfolio. In the case of short position, the CTS downside tail indices of R-ratio and Sharpe ratio strategies are smaller than the short position

of the cumulative return. Meanwhile, the CVaR and STARR strategies have larger λ_- values.

4.3. Global stock benchmark indices

As seen in Table 5, the outperformance of the alternative portfolios is also attained in the global stock benchmark index universe. While the cumulative return criterion obtains monthly 0.51% with standard deviation of 4.23%, the best performers are the R-ratio(90%,90%) and R-ratio(95%,95%) portfolios with 0.63% and 0.58%, respectively. The standard deviations of these strategies are 3.47% and 3.16%, much less volatile than the traditional momentum strategy. Accepting smaller return fluctuations, the STARR(90%), Sharpe ratio, and R-ratio(50%,90%) also provide higher average returns than the benchmark strategy. The performance of the R-ratio(50%,90%) and R-ratio(99%,99%) strategies are comparable with the cumulative return portfolio and the volatility level of those portfolios are significantly lower. Smaller standard deviations are also obtained by the other selection rules.

The strong performance of the winner baskets in the reward-risk strategies is found in the global benchmark index universe regardless of criterion. The winner groups obtain 0.86%–1.18% and the top 4 best long positions are from the R-ratio criteria. The long basket in the Sharpe ratio portfolio is also followed by the cumulative return winner group. Additionally, the volatility levels of these winner baskets are lower than the the benchmark case. The skewness of every R-ratio long position is greater than the traditional momentum case, i.e. the downside tails of the R-ratio strategies are thinner. For loser groups, the average returns are in the range of 0.46–0.60% while the cumulative return loser group achieves 0.49%. Although the loser groups of the reward-risk momentum strategies tend to perform slightly better than the original momentum strategy, smaller skewness is obtained by the short positions of the R-ratio and Sharpe-ratio portfolios. The smaller skewness imposes that the loser baskets are exposed to the more downside tail risk which are likely to generate the profits from the short positions.

In Table 6, it is found that the reward-risk strategies, in particular, the R-ratio strategies are less riskier than the traditional trend-following strategy. With 95% VaR and CVaR, all the reward-risk strategies, except for the STARR(99%) strategy, are less riskier than the benchmark strategy. Additionally, the maximum drawdowns of the R-ratio strategies are substantially lower than that of the cumulative return strategy. The Sharpe ratio, CVaR, and STARR momentum portfolios exhibit the comparable sizes of maximum drawdowns. Larger Sharpe ratios are obtained by the Sharpe ratio, R-ratio(90%,90%), R-ratio(50%,90%), and R-ratio(95%,95%) strategies. In this sense, the reward-risk portfolios generate more profits under less exposure to the risk. In particular, the R-ratio and Sharpe ratio criteria are better both in performance and risk.

The maximum drawdown of each ranking group is also well-matched to the purpose of the group. The winner baskets of the reward-risk strategies exhibit smaller maximum drawdowns and the maximum drawdowns of the losers are

higher. The 95% VaR and CVaR levels of these portfolios are slightly different with the maximum drawdown. The CVaR and STARR criteria feature lower VaRs and CVaRs than the long basket of the R-ratio and Sharpe ratio portfolio. The short baskets of the alternative portfolios obtain lower VaR and CVaR values than the momentum strategy.

4.4. South Korea equity market: KOSPI 200

In the KOSPI 200 universe, the reward-risk momentum strategies not only outperform the cumulative return strategy but also feature lower volatility. According to the summary statistics of the reward-risk strategies in Table 7, the best strategies are given by the STARR criteria. The STARR(90%) achieves monthly 1.62% with the volatility of 6.73% while the cumulative return provides monthly 0.97% with the standard deviation of 7.56%. The STARR(95%) and STARR(99%) portfolios are the next top performer obtaining the average returns of 1.53% and 1.50% and the monthly return fluctuation levels of the portfolios are 6.68% and 5.98%, respectively. The CVaR portfolios also obtain better performance and are less volatile than the cumulative return. The CVaR(99%), CVaR(95%) and CVaR(90%) based strategies generate 1.48%, 1.35%, and 1.24%, respectively. These CVaR criteria also have smaller standard deviations, 6.27%–6.94%.

Similar to other asset classes, the R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies also feature better performance than the traditional momentum strategy. The R-ratio(50%,99%) and R-ratio(50%,95%) strategies generate the monthly profits of 1.15%. The two alternative portfolios with the monthly volatility levels of 4.45%–4.67% are much less volatile not only than the original trend-following strategy but also than the CVaR and STARR portfolios. The R-ratio(50%,90%) portfolio with the average return of 1.00% and the volatility of 4.46% is still better in performance and risk. Although the Sharpe ratio strategy is slightly poorer in performance than the benchmark strategy, the standard deviation of the performance is much reduced. Meanwhile, the R-ratio(9X%,9X%) strategies underperform the momentum strategy although the strategies are less volatile in the deviation measure. Every reward-risk strategy is under larger skewness than the cumulative return strategy.

The behaviors of winner and loser deciles are followings. With the STARR and CVaR selection rules, the winner groups underperform that of the traditional momentum strategy by 0.10%. However, the loser groups perform much poorly than the loser group of the cumulative return strategy by 0.60%–0.70%. The different amounts of the shifts make the reward-risk strategies more profitable. Meanwhile, the winner and loser groups of the Sharpe ratio and R-ratio strategies tend to outperform the original trend-following strategy. The long/short positions of all the reward-risk portfolios exhibit the smaller skewness than the benchmark strategy.

The less riskier performance of the reward-risk strategies are also cross-checked with the risk characteristics given in Table 8. The maximum drawdowns of all the reward-risk strategies are substantially decreased. In particular, the maximum drawdowns of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies are 17.31%–

24.63%, significantly smaller than 63.97% of the traditional momentum strategy. The STARR portfolios also achieve 27.97%–33.46% and the CVaR criteria obtain 32.74%–35.92% of maximum drawdowns. The maximum drawdown of the Sharpe ratio portfolio is 49.57% which is higher than other criteria but still smaller than the benchmark case. More interesting caveat is that all the R-ratio momentum portfolios are remarkably less riskier because their VaRs and CVaRs are decreased by 30%–40%. The 95% VaR and CVaR levels of the STARR(99%), STARR(90%), Sharpe ratio, and CVaR(99%) strategies are also lower than those of the trend-following strategy. In addition to that, the λ_- values of all the R-ratio portfolios are larger than that of the momentum strategy. This fact indicates that those portfolios are under the lower tail risk. The Sharpe ratios of the Sharpe ratio, CVaR(99%) and R-ratio(50%,9X%) criteria are higher than that of the cumulative return portfolio.

The risk profile of each ranking basket is also consistent with the purpose of the ranking group. The winner (loser) groups of the reward-risk portfolios feature smaller (larger) risk measures such as VaR, CVaR, and maximum drawdowns. Larger (smaller) Sharpe ratios are available for the winner (loser) groups. It is also supported by the CTS parameter λ_- of each basket. The λ_- values for the winner (loser) deciles are greater (smaller) than that of the long (short) basket in the momentum portfolio. The risk characteristics of the ranking deciles in the R-ratio strategies are slightly different with other portfolios. The R-ratio strategies are also less riskier in the level of both ranking baskets. The winner and loser groups of the R-ratio portfolios are less riskier in 95% VaR and CVaR. The Sharpe ratios of the both baskets beat those of the benchmark ranking baskets.

4.5. U.S. equity market: SPDR sector ETFs

The R-ratio momentum strategies in the SPDR U.S. sector ETF universe exhibit better performance than the traditional momentum strategy as seen in Table 9. Comparing with the benchmark momentum strategy providing the monthly return of 0.33% and the standard deviation of 4.34%, the R-ratio(50%,99%), R-ratio(50%,90%), and R-ratio(50%,95%) portfolios generate monthly 0.62%, 0.58%, and 0.58%, respectively. The standard deviations of the portfolio returns are decreased by about 25%. The R-ratio(90%,90%) and Sharpe ratio criteria not only outperform the cumulative return portfolio by 0.08% and 0.04% but also obtain lower volatility levels. The other stock selection rules follow the original momentum strategy in performance. The skewness of every reward-risk strategy is larger than the cumulative return based strategy.

The excellent performance of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) portfolios is achieved by the strong momentum in each basket. The winner groups of the portfolios strongly outperform the winner group of the traditional momentum strategy. Meanwhile, the loser groups exhibit poorer performance than the loser of the benchmark strategy. The winner return of the R-ratio(90%,90%) portfolio is slightly worse but the loser return is much smaller than the momentum loser. The group behavior of the Sharpe ratio portfolio is similar to the R-ratio(90%,90%) case. Although the winner group underperforms the momen-

tum winner by 0.20%, the weakest performance among all the ranking rules is obtained by the Sharpe ratio losers. For the R-ratio and Sharpe ratio strategies, the skewness of the long (short) baskets is larger (smaller) than that of the momentum strategy.

It is noteworthy that the performance of the R-ratio strategies, in particular, the performance of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies is obtained by accepting less risks. Given in Table 10, all the R-ratio portfolios exhibit lower 95% VaRs and CVaRs than the benchmark momentum. The lower risks of the portfolios are also guaranteed by their larger λ_- values in the CTS model. Additionally, higher Sharpe ratios are achieved by the R-ratio(90%,90%) and R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies. Moreover, smaller maximum drawdown than the traditional momentum strategy is the unique feature of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies. Although all the CVaR and STARR portfolios are less riskier in the 95% VaR and CVaR levels, the performance of these strategies is poorer than the R-ratio portfolios.

The alternative portfolios are less riskier than the cumulative return strategy not only at the levels of entire portfolios but also in each ranking group of the portfolios. The winner and loser baskets of the R-ratio criteria, except for the R-ratio(95%, 95%) winner group, achieve lower 95% VaRs and CVaRs. In particular, the short baskets in the R-ratio(50%,9X%) portfolios exhibit the lowest VaR and CVaR levels. Additionally, the long/short positions in the R-ratio(50%,9X%) portfolio also feature smaller maximum drawdowns comparing with each long/short positions of the traditional momentum. With the CTS parameters, it is also cross-checked that these baskets in the R-ratio and Sharpe ratio portfolios are consistent with the directions of the price momentum. The λ_- parameters for the reward-risk winner groups are greater than that of the momentum strategy. Meanwhile, the λ_- values of the loser groups are smaller. This is much desirable for the momentum portfolio. Opposite to the R-ratio and Sharpe ratio strategies, the larger (smaller) λ_- for the short (long) baskets are the characteristics of the CTS parameters in the CVaR and STARR portfolios.

4.6. U.S. equity market: S&P 500

As shown in Table 11, the reward-risk momentum strategies in the S&P 500 universe outperform the traditional momentum and the best reward-risk portfolios are constructed by the R-ratio(50%,9X%) criteria. The R-ratio(50%,90%) strategy is the best portfolio of monthly 0.64%, almost three-times larger return than the cumulative return portfolio of 0.22%. Meanwhile, its standard deviation is monthly 2.73%, 50% smaller than the volatility of the original momentum strategy, 5.54%. Similar to the R-ratio(50%, 90%) case, the R-ratio(50%,95%) and R-ratio(50%,99%) portfolios obtain monthly 0.53% and 0.39% with the standard deviations of 2.83% and 2.64%, respectively. Comparing with the results in Rachev et al. [24], the returns of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) portfolios are increased and the volatility are reduced. However, the other strategies are not interesting because the performance of the portfolios are based on taking larger volatility. Additionally, the performance of these selection rules including the cumulative return becomes poorer since the original study [24].

The ranking group properties of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) portfolios are also attractive because each ranking group of the portfolios exhibit strong momentum. All the winner groups of these strategies outperform the traditional momentum long basket. Moreover, the loser groups of the R-ratio(50%,95%) and R-ratio(50%,90%) criteria underperform the momentum short basket and the performance of the R-ratio(50%,99%) loser group is slightly better by 0.03%. The ranking group characteristics of the STARR(90%) and Sharpe ratio portfolios are exactly opposite to those of the R-ratio(50%,99%) criterion, i.e. the winners underperform and the losers outperform the benchmark. In the cases of the STARR(95%), CVaR(90%) and CVaR(95%) measures, the weaker performance is observed for all the winner and loser groups. All winner and loser groups of every stock selection rules perform worse than those ranking groups of the reward-risk strategies in the previous study on the reward-risk momentum strategy [24].

The alternative ranking portfolios in the S&P 500 universe are less riskier according to Table 12. All the reward-risk momentum strategies feature lower 95% CVaRs. The 95% VaR levels depends on the criteria. In particular, the VaR and CVaR levels of the R-ratio strategies are substantially smaller than the risk measures of the cumulative return strategy. The Sharpe ratio portfolio also shows lower VaR and CVaR levels. Additionally, the λ_- parameters of the R-ratio and Sharpe ratio strategies, except for the R-ratio(95%,95%) and R-ratio(90%,90%) measures, are larger than that of the cumulative return. The larger λ_- of the reward-risk momentum strategies are good at controlling the downside tail risks. For maximum drawdown, the Sharpe ratio and the R-ratio portfolios exhibit better maximum drawdown values than the original momentum strategy. The maximum drawdowns of the R-ratio portfolios are impressively decreased. For example, the maximum drawdowns of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) portfolios are around 15% and it imposes that 75% of the maximum drawdown by the cumulative return criterion is gone away by choosing the R-ratio(50%,9X%) measures. The additional advantage of adopting the R-ratio(50%, 9X%) and Sharpe ratio as the stock selection rules is that the Sharpe ratios of the portfolios are about 2–5 times higher than the cumulative return portfolio.

The risk characteristics of the winner and loser groups also show that the reward-risk selection rules are desirable to the risk management of the constituent baskets. The λ_- parameters of the winner groups are larger than that of the cumulative return winner. It is evident that the lower downside risks in the winner groups are obtained by the alternative portfolios. Opposite to the long baskets, the λ_- values for the loser baskets are smaller than the loser group in the cumulative return criterion and it is attractive for the short baskets to take the larger downside risks to earn the profits from short-selling the losers. Most of the reward-risk measures provide the less riskier winner and loser groups with smaller 95% VaRs and CVaRs. In addition to that, the maximum drawdown of each basket is also lower than that of each long/short basket by the cumulative return criterion. In the R-ratio and Sharpe ratio portfolios, the comparable sizes of maximum drawdowns are obtained by the winner and loser groups. Meanwhile, for the CVaR and STARR portfolios, the maximum

drawdowns of the winner groups are much lower than those of the loser groups. This pattern is also observed in the cumulative return portfolio.

4.7. Overall results in various universes

In the various asset classes, the reward-risk measures are the better ranking rules that select the potential good and bad performers in next 6 months. In particular, the R-ratio(50%,9X%) measures generate the consistent outperformance with lower volatility. The outperformance of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) portfolios is also supported by the historical cumulative returns of the alternative portfolios given in Fig. 1. It is easy to find that the R-ratio(50%,9X%) not only outperform the traditional trend-following strategy but also tend to form consistent trends with less fluctuation. Additionally, the performance of the R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies is still consistent even during the financial crisis in 2008. The R-ratio(9X%,9X%) and Sharpe ratio also provide good performance and the portfolios are less riskier than the benchmark momentum strategy in many asset classes. Each long/short basket is also superior to the momentum strategy in performance.

The outperformance of the reward-risk momentum strategies is achieved not by taking more risk but by accepting less risk. In particular, the R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies are less riskier than the momentum portfolio in various risk measures such as Sharpe ratio, VaR, CVaR, and maximum drawdown. The dominance in risk profiles is also observed in the level of long/short baskets. Although the Sharpe ratio portfolio is not as good in performance as the R-ratio strategies, its risk profile imposes that the portfolio by the Sharpe ratio is also less riskier than the benchmark strategy.

In many asset classes, the patterns in performance and risk characteristics are categorized into two classes: The first class includes R-ratio and Sharpe ratio and the second group contains CVaR and STARR. It is noteworthy that the classification is also associated with the origin of the reward-risk measures. The reward-risk measures in the first category are all ratio-based measures. Meanwhile, the second category consist of the return/loss-based measures. The possible explanation on the outperformance of the ratio-based reward-risk measures is that the R-ratio and Sharpe ratio consider not only downside risk but also upward latent profit in the normalized scale. Opposite to the ratio measures, the return/loss based strategies tend to select the low-risk instruments in non-normalized scale. It is likely not to consider the volatility along the upward direction which is not the actual risk but the source of potential gain.

5. Factor analysis

As found in the previous section, the reward-risk momentum strategies feature the better characteristics in performance and risk. For more robust tests, the alternative strategies need to be cross-checked with various market factors. In particular, the Fama-French three-factor model [34] is one of the well-known regression models in finance. We analyze the results in the S&P 500 universe with the Fama-French three-factor model.

As seen in Table 13, the intercepts of the factor analysis on the reward-risk momentum strategies in the S&P 500 universe are generally greater than that of the traditional momentum strategy. The ranges of the three-factor alpha are dependent with the types of the alternative stock selection rules. Additionally, the three-factor alphas are statistically significant in many portfolios. The different factor structures with respect to the criteria are also found.

The first category in the factor structure is generated by the Sharpe ratio and R-ratio. For the momentum portfolios by these reward-risk measures, the exposures on the market factor and size factor are smaller than any other strategies. Moreover, very small R^2 values impose that the Fama-French three-factor model is not able to explain the return structures of the momentum portfolios constructed by the ratio-based reward-risk measures. The R-ratio(50%,90%) and R-ratio(50%, 95%) exhibit greater Fama-French three-factor alpha which is also statistically significant.

Another different factor structure is found in the CVaR and STARR portfolios. The statistically significant intercepts of the regression on these stock selection rules are much larger than the momentum strategies by the cumulative return and the ratio-based reward-risk measures. The sizes of the exposure on the market and size factors are substantially greater and statistically significant. The larger exposures to the Fama-French factors lead to the higher R^2. The large parts of the portfolio performance by these ranking rules are explained by the Fama-French three-factor model.

It is noteworthy that the classification for the different factor structures is also identical to the types of the stock selection rules. Not only performance and risk profiles but also the factor exposure highly depend the origin of the ranking criterion. These two groups of the momentum portfolio construction rules are considered the different categories of the reward-risk measures.

6. Conclusion

In this study, we test the alternative momentum portfolios based on the reward-risk measures in various asset classes and markets. The reward-risk measures include Sharpe ratio, CVaR, STARR, and R-ratio. The stock selection rules for the reward-risk momentum strategies are calculated from the ARMA(1,1)-GARCH(1,1) model with CTS innovations in order to explain autocorrelation, volatility clustering, skewness, and kurtosis in asset returns.

The reward-risk momentum portfolios achieve the better performance and risk characteristics independent with asset class and market. In particular, the R-ratio(50%,9X%) strategies outperform the traditional momentum strategy in every asset classes. Additionally, the long/short positions of these strategies exhibit the stronger momentum than the benchmark strategy, i.e, the winners outperform the long basket of the traditional momentum portfolio and the losers underperform the loser in the cumulative return. The R-ratio(9X%,9X%) and Sharpe ratio strategies also perform well under the smaller deviation.

The alternative portfolios are less riskier than the traditional momentum portfolio in VaR, CVaR, and maximum drawdown. The larger λ_- parameters

also guarantee the thinner downside tails of the portfolio returns. For each winner/loser group, the less riskier portfolios are also constructed by the alternative stock selection rules.

It is also observed that the performance and risk profile depend on the characteristics of the momentum group ranking criterion. The reward-risk measures such as R-ratio and Sharpe ratio construct the long/short portfolios with the better average returns and lower downside risks. This tendency is also found at the levels of long/short baskets.

The factor analysis in the S&P 500 universe supports the same conclusion that the factor structures are highly dependent with the types of the ranking criteria. Additionally, the Fama-French three-factor alpha is statistically significant and larger than that of the benchmark strategy and the momentum strategies by the ratio-based stock ranking rules are inexplicable by the Fama-French three factor model which explains the performance of the CVaR and STARR portfolios.

In future study, various kinds of risk models will be tested for the construction of alternative momentum-style portfolios. In addition to that, the implementation of the reward-risk momentum strategies will be extended to weekly, daily, and high frequency scales.

Acknowledgement

We are thankful to Frank J. Fabozzi and Svetlozar T. Rachev for useful discussions.

References

References

[1] Jegadeesh, N. and Titman, S., Returns to buying winners and selling losers: Implications for stock market efficiency, Journal of Finance 48 (1993) 65-91

[2] Rouwenhorst, K. G., International momentum strategies, Journal of Finance 53 (1998) 267-284

[3] Rouwenhorst, K. G., Local return factors and turnover in emerging stock markets, Journal of Finance 54 (1999) 1439-1464

[4] Okunev, J. and Derek W., Do momentum-based strategies still work in foreign currency markets?, Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis 38 (2003) 425-447

[5] Asness, C. S., Moskowitz, T., and Pedersen, L. H., Value and momentum everywhere, Journal of Finance 68 (2013) 929-985

[6] Moskowitz, T. J., Ooi, Y. H., and Pedersen, L. H., Time series momentum, Journal of Financial Economics 104 (2012) 228-250

[7] Erb, C. B. and Harvey, C. R., The strategic and tactical value of commodity futures, Financial Analysts Journal 62 (2006) 69-97

[8] Lo, A. W. and MacKinlay, A., When are contrarian profits due to stock market overreaction?, Review of Financial Studies 3 (1990) 175-205

[9] Lewellen, J., Momentum and autocorrelation in stock return, Review of Financial Studies 15 (2002) 533-563

[10] Hong, H. and Stein, J. C., A unified theory of underreaction, momentum trading and overreaction in asset markets, Journal of Finance 54 (1999) 2143-2184

[11] Terence, H., Hong, H., Lim, T., and Stein, J., Bad news travels slowly: Size, analyst coverage, and the profitability of momentum strategies, Journal of Finance 55 (2000) 265-295

[12] Daniel, K., Hirshleifer, D., and Subrahmanyam, A., Investor psychology and security market under- and over-reactions. Journal of Finance 53 (1998) 1839-1886

[13] Barberis, N., Shleifer, A., and Vishny, R., A model of investor sentiment. Journal of Financial Economics 49 (1998) 307-343

[14] Moskowitz, T. J. and Grinblatt M., Do industries explain momentum?, Journal of Finance 54 (1999) 1249-1290

[15] Lesmond, D. A., Schill, M. J., and Zhou, C., The illusory nature of momentum profits, Journal of Financial Economics 71 (2004) 349-380

[16] Lee, C. and Swaminathan, B., Price momentum and trading volume, Journal of Finance 55 (2000) 2017-2070

[17] Datar, V., Naik, N., and Radcliffe, R., Liquidity and asset returns: An alternative test, Journal of Financial Markets 1 (1998) 203-220

[18] Amihud, Y. and Mendelson, H., Asset pricing and the bid-ask spread, Journal of Financial Economics 17 (1986) 223-249

[19] Hu, S., Trading turnover and expected stock returns: the trading frequency hypothesis and evidence from the Tokyo Stock Exchange, Working paper, University of Chicago (1997)

[20] Amihud, Y., Illiquidity and stock returns: cross-section and time-series effect, Journal of Finanicial Markets 5 (2002) 31-56

[21] George, T. J. and Hwang, C., The 52-week high and momentum investing, Journal of Finance 59 (2004) 2145-2175

[22] Liu, M., Liu, Q., and Ma, T., The 52-week high momentum strategy in international stock markets, Journal of International Money and Finance 30 (2011) 180-204

[23] Choi, J., Physical approach to price momentum and its application to momentum strategy, arXiv:1208.2775

[24] Rachev, S., Jasic, T., Stoyanov, S., and Fabozzi, F., Momentum strategies based on reward-risk stock selection criteria, Journal of Banking and Finance 31 (2007) 2325-2346

[25] Rosinski, J., Tempering stable processes, Stochastic Processes and Their Applications 117 (2007) 677-707

[26] Kim, Y. S., Rachev, S. T., Bianchi, M. L., and Fabozzi, F. J., Tempered stable and tempered infinitely divisible GARCH models, Journal of Banking and Finance 34 (2010) 2096-2109

[27] Sharpe, W. F., The Sharpe ratio, Journal of Portfolio Management 21 (1994) 45-58

[28] Markowitz, H. M., Portfolio selection, Journal of Finance 7 (1952) 77-91

[29] Rockafellar, R. T. and Uryasev, S., Optimization of conditional Value-at-Risk, Journal of Risk 2 (2000) 21-41

[30] Rockafellar, R. T. and Uryasev, S., Conditional Value-at-Risk for general loss distributions, Journal of Banking and Finance 26 (2002) 1443-1471

[31] Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J., and Heath, D., Coherent measures of risk, Mathematical Finance 9 (1999) 203-228

[32] Bradley, B. O. and Taqqu, M. S., Financial risk and heavy tails, Handbook of Heavy Tailed Distributions in Finance, Elsevier/North-Holland, 1-69 (2003)

[33] Martin, R. D., Rachev, S., and Siboulet, F., Phi-alpha optimal portfolios and extreme risk management, Willmot Magazine of Finance (2003)

[34] Fama, E. F. and French, K. R., Multifactor explanations of asset pricing anomalies, Journal of Finance 51 (1996) 55-84



(a) Currency market

(b) Commodity market

(c) Global stock benchmark index

(d) South Korea KOSPI 200

(e) U.S. SPDR sector ETF

(f) U.S. S&P 500

Figure 1: Cumulative returns for the traditional momentum (gray), R-ratio(50%,99%) (blue), R-ratio(50%,95%) (red), and R-ratio(50%,90%) (green).

Table 1: Summary statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in currency markets

Criterion	Portfolio	Summary statistics				
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Final Wealth
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	0.0321	2.0745	-0.7740	5.4388	0.0751
	Loser (L)	-0.3050	2.3322	-0.1929	2.5957	-0.7138
	W – L	0.3371	2.3313	-0.1021	1.0460	0.7889
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	-0.1120	2.0836	-0.6513	2.7086	-0.2620
	Loser (L)	-0.1464	1.8203	-0.2558	3.1569	-0.3426
	W – L	0.0344	1.8672	-0.1799	1.4097	0.0806
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	-0.1505	1.1370	-0.0961	11.2495	-0.3522
	Loser (L)	-0.2853	2.5900	-0.4855	2.1489	-0.6677
	W – L	0.1348	2.1998	0.4062	2.5712	0.3155
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	-0.1715	1.1056	0.0751	13.8207	-0.4012
	Loser (L)	-0.2184	2.6403	-0.3228	1.6908	-0.5110
	W – L	0.0469	2.3552	0.1908	2.6448	0.1098
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	-0.1743	1.1531	0.1157	11.8002	-0.4078
	Loser (L)	-0.1944	2.6707	-0.3040	1.6134	-0.4549
	W – L	0.0201	2.4136	0.1001	2.4119	0.0471
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	-0.1533	1.1495	-0.1178	10.8946	-0.3586
	Loser (L)	-0.2692	2.5865	-0.4183	1.8526	-0.6299
	W – L	0.1159	2.2168	0.3393	2.3994	0.2713
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	-0.1761	1.1052	0.0937	13.8560	-0.4120
	Loser (L)	-0.2534	2.6841	-0.4140	2.1140	-0.5929
	W – L	0.0773	2.3860	0.2367	2.7273	0.1809
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	-0.1573	1.1573	0.1509	11.7092	-0.3680
	Loser (L)	-0.2025	2.6763	-0.2977	1.6779	-0.4739
	W – L	0.0452	2.4405	0.0818	2.3401	0.1059
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	-0.0133	1.7425	-0.0727	1.5723	-0.0310
	Loser (L)	-0.3182	1.8715	-0.5392	3.1297	-0.7447
	W – L	0.3050	1.5420	0.2915	2.8258	0.7137
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.0058	1.7369	-0.4895	0.9809	0.0135
	Loser (L)	-0.3549	1.7668	-0.3822	3.3337	-0.8305
	W – L	0.3607	1.4942	-0.0412	1.5296	0.8441
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	-0.0144	1.8151	-0.7065	2.0349	-0.0337
	Loser (L)	-0.3773	1.6853	-0.3615	3.9879	-0.8830
	W – L	0.3629	1.4896	-0.2404	2.2522	0.8492
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.0737	2.1660	-0.7656	3.0856	0.1725
	Loser (L)	-0.4499	1.4829	-0.6964	4.8830	-1.0529
	W – L	0.5237	1.8569	-0.2688	3.1975	1.2254
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.0722	2.0517	-0.7429	3.2594	0.1690
	Loser (L)	-0.4370	1.5174	-0.5894	4.5845	-1.0225
	W – L	0.5092	1.7138	-0.1580	3.8655	1.1916
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.0402	2.0641	-0.6512	2.3895	0.0940
	Loser (L)	-0.3994	1.5007	-0.5285	4.7091	-0.9346
	W – L	0.4395	1.7131	-0.0681	4.2952	1.0285

Table 2: Summary risk statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in currency markets

Criterion	Portfolio	CTS parameters			Risk measures			
		α	λ_+	λ_-	Sharpe	$\text{VaR}_{95\%}$	$\text{CVaR}_{95\%}$	MDD
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	0.3265	1.2321	1.2063	0.0000	0.3200	0.4291	29.98
	Loser (L)	1.0536	0.5899	0.5726	-0.0001	0.2962	0.4555	64.37
	W – L	0.1465	1.3847	1.4100	0.0002	0.3261	0.4293	26.90
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	0.0584	1.4679	1.4174	-0.0000	0.3445	0.4729	47.73
	Loser (L)	0.3092	1.0731	1.0843	-0.0001	0.2958	0.3679	46.76
	W – L	0.1027	1.4560	1.4315	0.0113	0.3963	0.4520	24.25
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	1.2291	0.2897	0.2671	0.0000	0.1712	0.2174	42.02
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.6772	1.5845	-0.0125	0.4893	0.6918	62.23
	W – L	0.0501	1.5106	1.5468	0.0031	0.4540	0.6377	27.70
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	1.2847	0.2185	0.2040	0.0000	0.1810	0.2169	43.36
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.7227	1.6260	-0.0064	0.5036	0.7111	59.02
	W – L	0.0500	1.5408	1.5664	-0.0021	0.4585	0.6398	32.19
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	1.3343	0.1935	0.1847	-0.0000	0.1811	0.2105	44.36
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.7320	1.6572	-0.0022	0.4989	0.7077	56.78
	W – L	0.0500	1.5443	1.5765	-0.0034	0.4734	0.6584	33.55
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	1.2225	0.2841	0.2664	0.0000	0.1706	0.2201	42.07
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.6806	1.5912	-0.0116	0.4772	0.6733	61.92
	W – L	0.0501	1.5352	1.5734	0.0039	0.4420	0.6174	27.76
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	1.2881	0.2160	0.2041	0.0000	0.1633	0.2162	43.43
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.7078	1.6164	-0.0093	0.5025	0.7101	61.57
	W – L	0.0502	1.5230	1.5469	-0.0001	0.4690	0.6604	32.61
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	1.2620	0.2207	0.2205	0.0000	0.1637	0.2127	43.90
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.6719	1.6098	-0.0036	0.5105	0.7212	58.21
	W – L	0.0500	1.5199	1.5387	-0.0020	0.4835	0.6797	33.22
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	1.6266	1.6361	0.0054	0.3023	0.4289	35.24
	Loser (L)	0.3003	1.0894	1.0830	0.0022	0.2316	0.3535	63.39
	W – L	0.5974	1.1324	1.2882	0.0127	0.2212	0.3161	14.44
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	1.6630	1.6881	0.0094	0.3294	0.4600	35.65
	Loser (L)	0.4629	0.9745	0.9448	-0.0002	0.2304	0.3563	64.74
	W – L	0.1903	1.5207	1.6450	0.0264	0.2452	0.3418	12.25
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.0501	1.6728	1.6901	0.0125	0.3336	0.4658	34.57
	Loser (L)	0.9131	0.6500	0.5814	0.0014	0.2211	0.3371	65.09
	W – L	0.2621	1.2970	1.3826	0.0250	0.2816	0.3495	10.96
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	1.6440	1.6473	0.0116	0.3919	0.5533	27.00
	Loser (L)	1.3377	0.3170	0.2621	-0.0001	0.1780	0.2770	67.89
	W – L	0.0624	1.5050	1.5960	0.0363	0.3310	0.4512	14.83
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	1.5884	1.5990	0.0243	0.3717	0.5262	28.34
	Loser (L)	1.1848	0.3975	0.3456	-0.0001	0.2248	0.3424	68.16
	W – L	1.2444	0.5611	0.5777	0.0326	0.3044	0.3960	13.30
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.0505	1.6138	1.6224	0.0147	0.3646	0.5146	33.36
	Loser (L)	1.2180	0.3736	0.3352	-0.0001	0.2299	0.3613	65.65
	W – L	1.2080	0.5865	0.5558	0.0264	0.2920	0.3800	12.46

Table 3: Summary statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in commodity markets

Criterion	Portfolio	Summary statistics				
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Final Wealth
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	0.4143	5.1784	-1.0806	5.2535	0.9694
	Loser (L)	1.2053	4.8953	-0.2249	1.3746	2.8204
	W – L	-0.7910	5.5935	-0.2445	0.2579	-1.8510
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	0.6064	5.1466	-0.8979	3.6700	1.4190
	Loser (L)	0.8273	4.3070	-0.6332	2.5603	1.9360
	W – L	-0.2209	4.5718	-0.0674	-0.3583	-0.5170
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.6631	3.6342	-0.8517	3.5270	1.5517
	Loser (L)	0.9276	5.2643	-0.2828	1.2405	2.1706
	W – L	-0.2645	4.3264	-0.2562	0.9318	-0.6189
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.5997	3.4050	-0.7986	3.9883	1.4033
	Loser (L)	0.9575	5.3540	-0.3387	1.2568	2.2406
	W – L	-0.3578	4.4633	-0.2766	0.6479	-0.8373
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.5338	3.3410	-0.9823	4.0281	1.2491
	Loser (L)	0.9718	5.4232	-0.3288	1.1617	2.2741
	W – L	-0.4380	4.5934	-0.1550	0.4317	-1.0250
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.5907	3.7046	-1.0038	4.3935	1.3823
	Loser (L)	0.9294	5.2586	-0.2552	1.4219	2.1747
	W – L	-0.3387	4.3930	-0.2675	0.9513	-0.7925
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.5376	3.5036	-0.9090	3.6746	1.2580
	Loser (L)	0.9299	5.3508	-0.2844	1.3115	2.1759
	W – L	-0.3923	4.4493	-0.3029	0.5762	-0.9179
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.4963	3.5004	-1.0908	4.9997	1.1613
	Loser (L)	0.9559	5.4563	-0.2540	1.2031	2.2367
	W – L	-0.4596	4.7060	-0.1914	0.5041	-1.0754
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.5915	4.4427	-0.8225	3.0958	1.3840
	Loser (L)	0.8540	4.3695	-0.4970	1.3058	1.9984
	W – L	-0.2626	4.0172	0.0491	0.2316	-0.6144
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.5374	4.2729	-1.0231	4.3569	1.2576
	Loser (L)	0.8656	4.1993	-0.2917	1.5985	2.0255
	W – L	-0.3282	3.9956	-0.1576	0.1118	-0.7679
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.5887	4.4228	-1.0648	4.6065	1.3775
	Loser (L)	0.8720	4.1982	-0.3809	1.7478	2.0406
	W – L	-0.2834	4.0549	-0.2807	0.2554	-0.6631
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.5581	4.8855	-1.1222	4.5402	1.3059
	Loser (L)	0.7970	4.1559	-0.6035	2.6882	1.8650
	W – L	-0.2390	4.1749	-0.1373	0.8693	-0.5592
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.5819	4.6565	-0.9870	4.0067	1.3616
	Loser (L)	0.8092	4.2402	-0.5323	2.5387	1.8936
	W – L	-0.2274	4.2693	-0.3293	0.5660	-0.5320
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.7209	4.7138	-0.8867	3.0352	1.6868
	Loser (L)	0.7806	4.3313	-0.4248	2.3588	1.8266
	W – L	-0.0597	4.3054	-0.4928	0.9752	-0.1397

Table 4: Summary risk statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in commodity markets

Criterion	Portfolio	CTS parameters			Risk measures			
		α	λ_+	λ_-	Sharpe	$\text{VaR}_{95\%}$	$\text{CVaR}_{95\%}$	MDD
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	1.3720	0.9916	0.6312	0.0350	1.0760	1.5650	61.66
	Loser (L)	0.1958	2.0049	1.9494	0.0604	1.1308	1.5448	35.93
	W – L	0.9216	1.4964	1.3690	-0.0176	1.3787	1.8632	85.75
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	0.4635	2.0927	1.6750	0.0430	1.1685	1.6479	59.19
	Loser (L)	0.8170	1.2921	1.2816	0.0414	1.1398	1.5368	43.66
	W – L	0.9183	1.3461	1.1814	0.0005	1.4338	1.9571	58.31
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.9785	1.2509	1.1633	0.0445	0.7570	1.0685	42.33
	Loser (L)	0.2422	2.2452	1.9497	0.0489	1.2025	1.6235	44.40
	W – L	1.0338	1.1273	1.5324	-0.0160	0.9733	1.2693	59.71
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.9448	1.3126	1.1662	0.0492	0.7446	1.0528	43.76
	Loser (L)	0.0500	2.4102	2.1969	0.0437	1.2350	1.6702	44.85
	W – L	0.9278	1.3522	1.5423	-0.0146	1.0126	1.3319	64.68
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.9245	1.3392	1.1408	0.0463	0.7632	1.0823	43.76
	Loser (L)	0.0501	2.3793	2.1784	0.0439	1.2369	1.6871	44.56
	W – L	0.3408	1.9163	2.0487	-0.0179	1.0914	1.4583	71.68
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.9331	1.3316	1.1827	0.0388	0.7990	1.1277	49.08
	Loser (L)	0.0500	2.4853	2.2204	0.0436	1.2130	1.6169	44.50
	W – L	1.1206	1.0505	1.3073	-0.0130	1.0099	1.3323	62.34
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.9266	1.3549	1.1489	0.0440	0.7475	1.0581	46.89
	Loser (L)	0.2859	2.1234	1.9041	0.0441	1.2462	1.6939	44.85
	W – L	0.9204	1.3606	1.6227	-0.0160	0.9901	1.3005	66.57
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.9181	1.3089	1.0937	0.0453	0.7500	1.0689	46.40
	Loser (L)	0.0501	2.3661	2.1507	0.0437	1.2607	1.7114	38.78
	W – L	0.9370	1.2727	1.4695	-0.0187	1.0747	1.4262	71.56
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.4814	1.7380	1.6970	0.0329	1.0402	1.3394	52.62
	Loser (L)	0.9261	1.5171	1.1059	0.0544	1.1560	1.6415	39.32
	W – L	0.9285	1.3067	1.5299	-0.0129	1.2503	1.6093	65.03
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.5422	1.7836	1.6769	0.0377	1.0174	1.3677	53.89
	Loser (L)	0.9138	1.4485	1.1528	0.0517	1.1874	1.6781	39.76
	W – L	0.9954	1.2907	1.3079	-0.0129	1.1978	1.5729	70.98
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.4029	2.2400	0.0438	1.0362	1.3952	53.33
	Loser (L)	0.8122	1.5034	1.2426	0.0487	1.2531	1.7657	37.30
	W – L	1.2229	0.9370	0.9757	-0.0060	1.1654	1.5548	70.40
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.1966	2.2214	2.0415	0.0399	1.0994	1.4746	56.55
	Loser (L)	1.0158	1.0838	0.9312	0.0433	0.9920	1.4269	38.76
	W – L	1.2547	0.9740	0.9249	-0.0021	1.0660	1.4203	60.97
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.9164	1.4355	1.2057	0.0409	1.0998	1.4837	53.13
	Loser (L)	0.9421	1.2119	1.0704	0.0432	0.9968	1.4152	43.02
	W – L	1.4945	0.6476	0.5690	0.0017	1.0466	1.4391	58.70
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.9074	1.6374	1.3227	0.0483	1.0802	1.4626	51.92
	Loser (L)	0.9641	1.2459	1.0570	0.0433	1.0282	1.4610	42.76
	W – L	0.9620	1.3896	1.3335	0.0055	1.0946	1.4697	52.20

Table 5: Summary statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in global stock benchmark indices

Criterion	Portfolio	Summary statistics				
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Final Wealth
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	0.9905	5.9325	-1.1304	3.7568	2.3178
	Loser (L)	0.4851	6.6008	-0.7938	3.0113	1.1350
	W – L	0.5054	4.2311	0.1320	0.8529	1.1827
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	1.0586	5.8729	-1.2502	4.7906	2.4772
	Loser (L)	0.5297	5.8772	-0.8649	3.6942	1.2396
	W – L	0.5289	3.3999	-0.1069	0.5636	1.2377
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.8723	4.9680	-1.1605	3.9285	2.0412
	Loser (L)	0.5861	7.3019	-0.7672	1.9657	1.3715
	W – L	0.2862	3.9970	0.4240	2.8749	0.6697
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.8593	4.9428	-1.3736	5.1772	2.0107
	Loser (L)	0.5398	7.3079	-0.7509	1.7926	1.2632
	W – L	0.3194	4.0510	0.3798	2.4666	0.7475
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.9216	5.0045	-1.2665	4.8889	2.1566
	Loser (L)	0.4636	7.2697	-0.7344	1.6345	1.0848
	W – L	0.4580	4.0226	0.3939	2.3733	1.0718
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.9361	4.9617	-1.3080	4.4615	2.1905
	Loser (L)	0.5785	7.2497	-0.7217	1.7708	1.3537
	W – L	0.3576	4.0123	0.3719	3.0792	0.8368
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.9017	5.0220	-1.3293	4.9186	2.1100
	Loser (L)	0.5332	7.1981	-0.7311	1.8412	1.2477
	W – L	0.3685	3.9964	0.2788	2.7878	0.8623
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	1.0039	5.0770	-1.3917	5.4502	2.3490
	Loser (L)	0.4689	7.1887	-0.7465	1.7680	1.0972
	W – L	0.5350	3.9795	0.4948	2.9160	1.2518
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	1.0947	5.7644	-0.7168	2.2020	2.5617
	Loser (L)	0.6166	5.8873	-1.0293	2.9335	1.4429
	W – L	0.4781	2.8936	0.5906	3.8428	1.1188
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	1.1799	5.9191	-0.6809	2.5225	2.7610
	Loser (L)	0.5993	5.9333	-0.9607	3.0226	1.4025
	W – L	0.5806	3.1583	0.1902	3.4522	1.3585
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	1.1711	5.9908	-0.8077	3.3492	2.7405
	Loser (L)	0.5449	6.0320	-1.0438	3.5434	1.2751
	W – L	0.6262	3.4709	0.1290	2.5468	1.4653
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.9422	5.9046	-1.0095	4.1233	2.2049
	Loser (L)	0.5731	5.8747	-0.9605	4.1299	1.3410
	W – L	0.3692	3.0054	-0.0994	2.6143	0.8639
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.9426	5.8568	-0.9330	4.1479	2.2058
	Loser (L)	0.5306	5.9947	-1.0009	3.6159	1.2415
	W – L	0.4121	3.3019	-0.1268	2.0959	0.9643
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	1.0995	6.0004	-0.9742	4.4194	2.5729
	Loser (L)	0.5948	6.0052	-0.9199	3.6425	1.3919
	W – L	0.5047	3.3742	-0.2066	2.0993	1.1810

Table 6: Summary risk statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in global stock benchmark indices

Criterion	Portfolio	CTS parameters			Risk measures			
		α	λ_+	λ_-	Sharpe	$\text{VaR}_{95\%}$	$\text{CVaR}_{95\%}$	MDD
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.0979	1.9009	0.0968	0.6016	0.8975	66.04
	Loser (L)	0.0503	1.8561	1.7458	0.0150	1.1133	1.6152	59.87
	W – L	0.0500	1.9911	1.9836	0.0397	0.8778	1.2456	39.25
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	0.1611	1.9514	1.7597	0.0890	0.6364	0.9404	61.60
	Loser (L)	0.8824	1.2630	1.1015	0.0478	0.9627	1.4030	56.83
	W – L	0.0500	1.8594	1.8528	0.0450	0.7009	0.9868	36.68
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.7714	1.5418	1.2731	0.0811	0.6222	0.9331	57.18
	Loser (L)	0.0501	1.9593	1.8333	0.0588	0.9804	1.4291	64.82
	W – L	0.0505	1.8343	1.9519	-0.0156	0.8550	1.1789	38.42
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.0608	1.9121	0.0784	0.6208	0.9172	58.40
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.8935	1.7896	0.0563	0.9796	1.4324	64.76
	W – L	0.0501	1.7456	1.8405	-0.0131	0.8602	1.1868	39.25
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.1249	1.9480	0.0842	0.6146	0.8973	57.76
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.9191	1.8091	0.0532	0.9805	1.4302	64.79
	W – L	0.0500	1.7962	1.8969	-0.0041	0.8606	1.1760	40.41
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.1835	2.0098	1.8181	0.0850	0.6149	0.9185	59.81
	Loser (L)	0.0502	1.9893	1.8419	0.0580	0.9843	1.4329	62.56
	W – L	1.3829	0.3941	0.4447	-0.0000	0.8781	1.3049	38.01
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.1778	1.9757	0.0887	0.5990	0.8842	60.07
	Loser (L)	0.0501	1.9396	1.8233	0.0555	0.9902	1.4404	63.10
	W – L	0.0500	1.7790	1.8637	0.0005	0.8368	1.1590	40.45
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.2164	2.0290	0.0899	0.5915	0.8724	61.03
	Loser (L)	0.0501	1.9499	1.8431	0.0522	1.0621	1.5389	62.43
	W – L	0.0500	1.7647	1.8517	0.0077	0.8716	1.2138	39.07
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	1.9375	1.8094	0.0682	0.7317	1.0762	61.95
	Loser (L)	0.0530	2.0874	1.9035	0.0667	0.6960	1.0160	59.22
	W – L	0.0500	1.8410	1.8344	0.0285	0.5720	0.7874	26.74
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	1.8674	1.7495	0.0814	0.7375	1.0939	61.81
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.9943	1.8418	0.0563	0.7425	1.0792	60.21
	W – L	0.0500	1.9181	1.8727	0.0386	0.5661	0.7748	28.23
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	1.9043	1.7863	0.0815	0.7076	1.0518	63.97
	Loser (L)	0.0501	1.8711	1.7454	0.0482	0.7780	1.1356	60.17
	W – L	0.0500	1.8931	1.8639	0.0442	0.5518	0.7645	30.55
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.0586	1.8799	0.0616	0.6885	1.0175	61.59
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.8478	1.7322	0.0530	0.8224	1.2045	63.54
	W – L	0.0500	1.6900	1.7341	0.0318	0.5997	0.8451	26.25
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.1160	1.9211	0.0741	0.6881	1.0143	60.93
	Loser (L)	0.0500	1.8117	1.7401	0.0474	0.8394	1.2234	61.02
	W – L	0.0500	1.8467	1.8361	0.0328	0.5631	0.7899	27.79
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.0039	1.8754	0.0878	0.6834	1.0134	62.75
	Loser (L)	0.0501	1.8849	1.7849	0.0537	0.8326	1.2112	59.56
	W – L	0.0500	2.0022	1.9599	0.0422	0.5403	0.7582	23.14

Table 7: Summary statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in South Korea KOSPI 200

Criterion	Portfolio	Summary statistics				
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Final Wealth
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	1.4398	9.0217	-0.3171	2.2066	1.6414
	Loser (L)	0.4684	9.1068	-0.4597	4.1819	0.5339
	W – L	0.9714	7.5597	0.0182	0.7296	1.1074
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	1.8949	8.1841	-0.4886	2.1096	2.1602
	Loser (L)	0.9584	8.0359	-0.8615	5.0522	1.0925
	W – L	0.9365	5.6301	0.3053	0.5808	1.0677
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	1.3118	5.7065	-0.6048	2.8393	1.4955
	Loser (L)	-0.1689	9.9050	-1.5460	10.0696	-0.1925
	W – L	1.4807	6.2786	1.0819	5.9193	1.6880
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	1.2905	5.5849	-0.4143	2.5666	1.4712
	Loser (L)	-0.0613	10.2952	-1.1747	7.5463	-0.0699
	W – L	1.3519	6.9397	0.5886	3.6766	1.5411
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	1.2074	5.5331	-0.6038	3.1926	1.3765
	Loser (L)	-0.0341	10.2453	-1.0795	6.6876	-0.0388
	W – L	1.2415	6.7954	0.3954	2.8837	1.4153
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	1.3306	5.8878	-0.7975	4.3349	1.5169
	Loser (L)	-0.1647	9.8757	-1.5148	10.2862	-0.1878
	W – L	1.4953	5.9833	0.7815	4.3467	1.7046
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	1.3460	5.7153	-0.5123	3.2865	1.5344
	Loser (L)	-0.1814	10.1670	-0.9790	6.8045	-0.2068
	W – L	1.5274	6.6811	0.3329	2.4814	1.7412
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	1.3591	5.5502	-0.6069	3.7614	1.5494
	Loser (L)	-0.2631	10.2472	-0.9260	6.0243	-0.2999
	W – L	1.6222	6.7347	0.1402	1.9444	1.8493
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	1.4438	7.8759	-0.7614	2.3934	1.6459
	Loser (L)	0.9616	7.6100	-1.3860	5.6460	1.0963
	W – L	0.4821	4.3156	-0.2820	-0.0043	0.5496
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	1.3230	7.7621	-0.6399	3.4614	1.5082
	Loser (L)	0.8531	7.7857	-1.2492	5.0462	0.9725
	W – L	0.4699	4.6851	0.2020	0.2420	0.5357
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	1.5087	7.4916	-0.3809	2.7238	1.7199
	Loser (L)	0.8257	7.5730	-1.3530	5.6923	0.9413
	W – L	0.6829	4.5874	0.3489	0.5876	0.7785
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	1.7095	7.6654	-0.7838	3.7805	1.9488
	Loser (L)	0.5574	7.9100	-1.3168	6.6333	0.6355
	W – L	1.1521	4.4496	0.2340	0.3793	1.3134
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	1.7754	7.8268	-0.7106	3.8838	2.0239
	Loser (L)	0.6279	7.7797	-1.1171	5.5356	0.7158
	W – L	1.1474	4.6714	0.3849	1.4663	1.3081
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	1.7137	7.5797	-0.6446	3.6913	1.9537
	Loser (L)	0.7159	7.9767	-0.9611	5.0985	0.8161
	W – L	0.9978	4.4564	0.3819	1.8013	1.1375

Table 8: Summary risk statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in South Korea KOSPI 200

Criterion	Portfolio	CTS parameters			Risk measures			
		α	λ_+	λ_-	Sharpe	$\text{VaR}_{95\%}$	$\text{CVaR}_{95\%}$	MDD
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	0.8478	2.1575	1.2321	0.0574	1.3611	1.9685	63.36
	Loser (L)	0.7857	2.6316	1.3006	0.0597	1.7720	2.5289	61.04
	W – L	0.7958	1.8394	1.8233	0.0301	1.8387	2.4195	63.97
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	0.7768	2.3318	1.2925	0.0857	1.3897	2.0182	63.52
	Loser (L)	0.6705	2.8222	1.3440	0.0793	1.4732	2.0966	57.35
	W – L	0.0500	3.2275	3.0301	0.0386	1.4387	1.9039	49.57
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.7763	2.1096	1.3939	0.0856	1.2377	1.7574	43.27
	Loser (L)	0.8115	2.1446	1.0821	0.0435	1.8999	2.7423	76.76
	W – L	1.4470	0.5609	1.1020	0.0404	1.7143	2.1861	32.74
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.7997	1.9605	1.3082	0.0845	1.1781	1.7147	42.86
	Loser (L)	0.8220	2.5174	1.1561	0.0444	2.0738	2.8467	74.27
	W – L	0.8787	1.1987	1.8770	0.0270	1.9567	2.4884	35.70
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.4379	2.3799	1.7123	0.0852	1.2029	1.7302	43.77
	Loser (L)	0.8320	2.5104	1.1420	0.0461	2.0740	2.9225	72.88
	W – L	1.1769	0.8078	1.5383	0.0172	1.9343	2.5135	35.92
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.7518	2.0932	1.4361	0.0826	1.2487	1.7661	48.34
	Loser (L)	0.8042	2.0746	1.0620	0.0446	1.8875	2.7616	76.01
	W – L	1.4385	0.5687	1.0741	0.0399	1.6948	2.1915	27.97
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.6662	2.2644	1.5439	0.0869	1.2036	1.7098	45.15
	Loser (L)	0.7992	2.1960	1.1022	0.0423	2.0961	2.9631	73.99
	W – L	1.2638	0.7440	1.3256	0.0333	2.0472	2.5786	30.97
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.6063	2.3069	1.6306	0.0868	1.1812	1.6821	44.97
	Loser (L)	0.8128	2.1695	1.0729	0.0415	2.0908	2.9479	73.93
	W – L	1.3431	0.6194	1.3335	0.0301	1.9072	2.3904	33.46
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.8585	2.7585	1.2858	0.0800	1.3245	1.9144	59.63
	Loser (L)	0.8275	2.1835	1.1921	0.0732	1.3315	1.9277	62.41
	W – L	0.7841	1.9352	1.9353	0.0219	1.2057	1.6272	36.54
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.8744	2.8021	1.3169	0.0708	1.2916	1.8392	62.61
	Loser (L)	0.8931	2.0968	1.1701	0.0704	1.4142	2.0419	64.15
	W – L	0.3083	3.4434	3.5048	0.0159	1.2456	1.6523	37.59
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.7927	3.0129	1.5758	0.0744	1.3054	1.8505	57.92
	Loser (L)	0.8319	2.2215	1.1868	0.0717	1.4654	2.1195	62.89
	W – L	0.7879	1.8989	2.1168	0.0192	1.2328	1.6690	25.50
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.7840	3.3015	1.6325	0.0763	1.3522	1.9132	58.96
	Loser (L)	0.8136	2.3232	1.1549	0.0642	1.4451	2.0702	62.14
	W – L	0.8466	1.6880	1.8100	0.0495	1.2995	1.7366	17.31
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.8499	4.6116	1.8431	0.0761	1.3130	1.8300	58.86
	Loser (L)	0.8250	2.3388	1.1320	0.0629	1.3904	2.0094	61.30
	W – L	0.7449	2.1419	2.2175	0.0480	1.2479	1.6763	22.01
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.8037	3.9623	1.7733	0.0779	1.3327	1.8677	58.31
	Loser (L)	0.8393	2.0942	1.0814	0.0629	1.4042	2.0388	61.13
	W – L	0.7499	2.0112	2.2066	0.0398	1.2411	1.6618	24.63

Table 9: Summary statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in U.S. sector ETF

Criterion	Portfolio	Summary statistics				
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Final Wealth
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	0.5893	4.8317	-0.8700	1.9482	0.9547
	Loser (L)	0.2624	5.4676	-0.4482	0.7811	0.4251
	W – L	0.3269	4.3365	-0.2319	1.1894	0.5296
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	0.3945	4.6092	-0.7806	1.9449	0.6391
	Loser (L)	0.0234	5.5951	-0.7454	1.3787	0.0379
	W – L	0.3711	4.1907	0.0029	0.7015	0.6012
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.3114	3.8428	-0.6689	1.7318	0.5045
	Loser (L)	0.3166	5.7499	-0.3607	0.5737	0.5129
	W – L	-0.0052	3.9082	-0.1820	0.2317	-0.0084
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.2845	3.7622	-0.7628	1.9346	0.4608
	Loser (L)	0.2954	5.7979	-0.3878	0.6469	0.4786
	W – L	-0.0109	3.9062	-0.2081	0.7141	-0.0177
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.2743	3.8143	-0.8560	2.3086	0.4443
	Loser (L)	0.2854	5.8318	-0.4204	0.7283	0.4623
	W – L	-0.0111	4.0001	-0.1735	0.9543	-0.0180
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.3455	3.8289	-0.6884	1.8070	0.5597
	Loser (L)	0.2731	5.7228	-0.3611	0.5414	0.4424
	W – L	0.0724	3.8656	-0.2519	0.3406	0.1173
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.3444	3.7157	-0.7922	2.1487	0.5580
	Loser (L)	0.2810	5.7486	-0.4395	0.8571	0.4552
	W – L	0.0635	4.0613	0.0032	1.1248	0.1028
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.3101	3.8911	-0.9767	2.8362	0.5024
	Loser (L)	0.3362	5.9748	-0.6140	1.1656	0.5447
	W – L	-0.0261	4.1620	0.1635	1.4122	-0.0423
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.3139	5.4340	-0.4896	1.3947	0.5085
	Loser (L)	0.4029	4.6333	-0.7555	1.0687	0.6527
	W – L	-0.0890	3.4372	0.2474	0.7772	-0.1442
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.4568	5.3861	-0.6746	2.2600	0.7400
	Loser (L)	0.3419	4.7851	-0.7264	0.9766	0.5538
	W – L	0.1149	3.3018	0.0994	1.0158	0.1862
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.5282	5.4281	-0.6998	2.1819	0.8557
	Loser (L)	0.1164	4.7575	-0.6552	0.9961	0.1886
	W – L	0.4117	3.4053	-0.0449	1.6380	0.6670
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.7366	4.8968	-0.5125	1.9995	1.1933
	Loser (L)	0.1178	4.7254	-0.6995	1.0059	0.1908
	W – L	0.6188	3.1334	0.0903	2.0793	1.0025
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.7152	4.9317	-0.5214	1.8685	1.1586
	Loser (L)	0.1396	4.5916	-0.7736	1.1658	0.2261
	W – L	0.5756	3.2177	0.1278	1.7826	0.9325
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.6417	4.7736	-0.4945	1.7924	1.0396
	Loser (L)	0.0568	4.7619	-0.6846	1.1489	0.0920
	W – L	0.5849	3.2278	-0.0048	1.5170	0.9475

Table 10: Summary risk statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in U.S. sector ETF

Criterion	Portfolio	CTS parameters			Risk measures			
		α	λ_+	λ_-	Sharpe	$\text{VaR}_{95\%}$	$\text{CVaR}_{95\%}$	MDD
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	0.7510	2.3565	1.5212	0.0590	1.5412	1.8948	52.83
	Loser (L)	0.3234	2.1317	1.7751	-0.0029	1.9601	2.1292	62.58
	W – L	1.2096	1.4824	1.0474	0.0172	0.6720	0.9158	25.32
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	0.0500	3.0977	2.2654	0.0552	1.4819	1.8030	50.70
	Loser (L)	0.5778	2.3207	1.6956	0.0258	1.5013	1.8289	64.97
	W – L	1.3215	1.0726	0.7875	0.0001	0.6593	0.9272	35.56
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.2447	2.5717	1.9223	0.0449	1.1536	1.4848	42.45
	Loser (L)	0.0500	2.9443	2.3076	0.0416	1.6355	1.9388	60.41
	W – L	1.4094	1.1638	1.0081	-0.0100	0.7431	0.9087	36.32
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.0738	2.8638	2.1811	0.0457	1.1600	1.4861	39.80
	Loser (L)	0.0500	3.0203	2.3330	0.0435	1.6519	1.9624	61.22
	W – L	1.3516	1.1409	1.1704	-0.0114	0.7370	0.8886	35.79
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.6494	2.3053	1.5313	0.0460	1.1581	1.4960	39.80
	Loser (L)	0.4007	2.5791	1.8816	0.0429	1.6654	1.9852	60.65
	W – L	0.7996	1.8891	1.9635	-0.0120	0.7461	0.8990	37.93
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.4908	2.3868	1.6844	0.0466	1.1495	1.4850	39.80
	Loser (L)	0.0500	2.9984	2.3374	0.0401	1.6376	1.9359	60.41
	W – L	1.3896	1.1154	1.0433	-0.0062	0.7236	0.8762	32.04
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.7268	2.1082	1.4191	0.0485	1.1460	1.4937	39.80
	Loser (L)	0.1450	2.7832	2.1184	0.0432	1.6661	1.9790	61.22
	W – L	1.2936	1.2148	1.1946	-0.0031	0.7203	0.8599	36.49
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.7726	2.0945	1.3625	0.0483	1.1549	1.5055	42.83
	Loser (L)	0.1435	2.8353	2.1773	0.0445	1.6583	1.9678	62.96
	W – L	1.4297	1.0748	1.0378	-0.0045	0.7255	0.8609	37.02
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.6470	2.1651	0.0228	1.4620	1.7950	58.12
	Loser (L)	0.5290	2.2609	1.5640	0.0474	1.4211	1.7881	50.45
	W – L	0.7145	2.1055	2.5068	-0.0146	0.5459	0.6897	48.19
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.0501	2.6370	2.1358	0.0309	1.6082	1.9410	56.56
	Loser (L)	0.8360	1.9846	1.2608	0.0477	1.4153	1.7994	47.32
	W – L	0.0500	3.3436	3.8430	0.0003	0.6524	0.8080	44.55
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.6752	2.1438	0.0353	1.4952	1.8316	52.73
	Loser (L)	0.3301	2.3987	1.8375	0.0398	1.3556	1.6775	53.38
	W – L	0.9987	1.5025	1.5760	0.0233	0.6390	0.8486	29.94
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.8326	2.2048	0.0488	1.4879	1.7827	42.85
	Loser (L)	0.8534	1.8963	1.2870	0.0328	1.3333	1.6576	53.40
	W – L	0.9556	1.4507	1.3746	0.0233	0.6208	0.8352	17.11
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.9408	2.2423	0.0535	1.5155	1.8095	42.85
	Loser (L)	0.8312	1.9537	1.3455	0.0418	1.3301	1.6550	53.40
	W – L	0.8906	1.6341	1.5288	0.0184	0.6306	0.8416	19.33
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.9660	2.2672	0.0518	1.5180	1.8059	43.33
	Loser (L)	0.8150	1.9530	1.3654	0.0377	1.3322	1.6544	53.40
	W – L	0.7904	1.7991	1.6057	0.0211	0.6354	0.8506	22.56

Table 11: Summary statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in U.S. S&P 500

Criterion	Portfolio	Summary statistics				
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Final Wealth
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	0.5589	5.5887	-0.7507	1.0164	0.6371
	Loser (L)	0.3369	7.8426	-0.2007	2.3590	0.3841
	W – L	0.2220	5.5408	-0.8821	4.2380	0.2531
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	0.4825	5.4366	-1.2614	3.0440	0.5501
	Loser (L)	0.3417	6.4953	-0.7847	2.9677	0.3895
	W – L	0.1408	4.7980	-0.4827	2.5523	0.1605
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.4648	2.9705	-1.8157	6.4702	0.5299
	Loser (L)	0.4934	7.7577	-0.2225	1.5735	0.5625
	W – L	-0.0287	5.9358	-0.3818	2.4592	-0.0327
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.4653	2.8899	-1.7931	6.2756	0.5304
	Loser (L)	0.2432	8.3895	-0.4173	1.1078	0.2773
	W – L	0.2220	6.7451	-0.0358	1.4197	0.2531
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.4953	2.8628	-1.8302	6.4437	0.5646
	Loser (L)	0.3187	8.6751	-0.2324	1.2326	0.3633
	W – L	0.1766	7.0064	-0.2602	1.6025	0.2013
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.5020	2.9350	-1.7080	5.7548	0.5722
	Loser (L)	0.4631	7.8568	-0.2536	1.6442	0.5280
	W – L	0.0388	6.0815	-0.3588	2.6549	0.0443
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.5010	2.8426	-1.7691	6.1334	0.5712
	Loser (L)	0.2534	8.4243	-0.3394	0.9851	0.2888
	W – L	0.2477	6.7372	-0.1568	1.0950	0.2823
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.5056	2.8500	-1.8692	6.5580	0.5764
	Loser (L)	0.3594	8.6919	-0.1974	1.1333	0.4098
	W – L	0.1462	7.0042	-0.3702	1.7272	0.1666
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.5720	5.1224	-1.1428	4.3427	0.6520
	Loser (L)	0.7517	5.2703	-0.8659	1.8257	0.8570
	W – L	-0.1798	2.0233	0.9705	5.9285	-0.2049
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.6804	4.8809	-1.3971	5.3933	0.7756
	Loser (L)	0.5968	5.2557	-1.0893	2.3207	0.6804
	W – L	0.0836	2.0793	0.6011	0.9863	0.0952
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.5715	4.7584	-1.3633	5.6386	0.6515
	Loser (L)	0.3841	5.3097	-1.0707	2.4322	0.4379
	W – L	0.1874	2.3672	-0.0205	0.1447	0.2137
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.7587	5.0256	-0.9462	5.0715	0.8649
	Loser (L)	0.3654	5.3213	-0.9708	2.1627	0.4166
	W – L	0.3933	2.6369	0.2485	1.1724	0.4484
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.7762	4.7852	-1.0896	5.3304	0.8849
	Loser (L)	0.2483	5.4449	-1.0573	2.2293	0.2830
	W – L	0.5279	2.8255	-0.0482	1.8141	0.6018
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.7654	4.7863	-1.0044	4.9962	0.8726
	Loser (L)	0.1296	5.3085	-1.0210	2.2957	0.1477
	W – L	0.6358	2.7326	-0.0795	1.3808	0.7249

Table 12: Summary risk statistics of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in U.S. S&P 500

Criterion	Portfolio	CTS parameters			Risk measures			
		α	λ_+	λ_-	Sharpe	$\text{VaR}_{95\%}$	$\text{CVaR}_{95\%}$	MDD
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	0.8861	2.1267	1.1819	0.0003	1.8478	2.2138	59.55
	Loser (L)	0.0500	3.7818	2.7937	0.0358	1.9232	2.0562	78.90
	W – L	1.1751	1.5755	1.2925	0.0078	1.2477	1.6680	59.71
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	0.4746	2.5494	1.6115	0.0533	1.5337	1.9249	64.29
	Loser (L)	0.8142	3.4789	1.8520	0.0387	1.8531	1.9718	70.73
	W – L	0.5964	2.9640	2.5113	0.0182	1.0839	1.3332	49.50
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.3656	1.8691	0.0686	1.0915	1.4658	43.31
	Loser (L)	0.7968	3.8780	1.9720	0.0357	1.8102	1.9908	72.92
	W – L	0.3462	3.1218	3.6005	-0.0071	1.1925	1.3448	60.29
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.0501	2.4449	1.9059	0.0708	1.0990	1.4700	41.14
	Loser (L)	0.7347	3.1873	1.8628	0.0353	1.8524	2.0175	78.53
	W – L	0.3278	3.1024	3.7552	-0.0114	1.3335	1.4625	60.63
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.4971	1.9367	0.0721	1.1096	1.4723	39.82
	Loser (L)	0.2386	3.5081	2.4162	0.0366	1.9168	2.1219	78.57
	W – L	0.0614	3.3466	3.9793	-0.0151	1.3596	1.5191	61.41
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.3644	1.8484	0.0709	1.0980	1.4838	42.90
	Loser (L)	0.7670	3.7859	2.0132	0.0363	1.6748	1.8117	73.82
	W – L	0.2788	3.2625	3.7744	-0.0051	1.1199	1.2490	60.80
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.3256	1.8339	0.0708	1.0970	1.4780	40.41
	Loser (L)	0.7337	3.1198	1.8558	0.0341	1.8675	2.0504	78.24
	W – L	0.4629	2.8693	3.3958	-0.0078	1.3407	1.4872	60.85
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.0501	2.4325	1.8814	0.0733	1.1099	1.4836	40.52
	Loser (L)	0.4306	3.4380	2.3083	0.0350	1.9809	2.1363	78.62
	W – L	0.0877	3.7570	4.2363	-0.0109	1.4510	1.5826	63.83
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.1787	3.1398	2.1485	0.0573	1.4580	1.7811	60.75
	Loser (L)	0.4969	2.7568	1.7266	0.0664	1.4836	1.7320	54.41
	W – L	0.7684	1.7629	2.0395	-0.0256	0.4299	0.5620	26.20
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.1662	2.8518	1.9817	0.0629	1.4310	1.7470	58.33
	Loser (L)	0.2141	2.9262	2.0650	0.0605	1.3994	1.6769	55.39
	W – L	1.5057	0.8361	0.8384	-0.0057	0.3827	0.5155	19.48
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.8640	2.0565	0.0595	1.4001	1.7342	57.40
	Loser (L)	0.8505	2.6170	1.4780	0.0522	1.4632	1.7373	59.07
	W – L	1.5972	0.5932	0.5247	0.0063	0.4317	0.6008	15.72
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.4632	2.7405	1.6787	0.0650	1.4093	1.7276	54.79
	Loser (L)	0.5545	3.3607	2.0531	0.0489	1.4725	1.7052	59.64
	W – L	0.5909	2.4827	2.2535	0.0282	0.4856	0.6559	14.96
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.0500	2.8730	2.0207	0.0653	1.3924	1.7017	53.42
	Loser (L)	0.7764	2.8824	1.5795	0.0455	1.4935	1.7505	61.18
	W – L	1.0335	1.5251	1.3447	0.0303	0.4366	0.5966	15.78
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.2868	2.8634	1.8263	0.0665	1.4015	1.7125	54.69
	Loser (L)	0.8508	2.9716	1.5304	0.0417	1.5503	1.7739	62.20
	W – L	0.7900	1.7982	1.6932	0.0413	0.4813	0.6399	15.85

Table 13: Fama-French regression of monthly 6/6 momentum portfolios in U.S. S&P 500

Criterion	Portfolio	Factor loadings				
		$\alpha(\%)$	β_{MKT}	β_{SMB}	β_{HML}	R^2
Cumulative return	Winner (W)	-0.0643	1.0236**	0.3201*	0.0357	0.7699
	Loser (L)	-0.5487	1.4993**	0.2091	0.2665	0.8086
	W – L	0.4844	-0.4757**	0.1110	-0.2307	0.1616
Sharpe ratio	Winner (W)	-0.0887	1.0443**	0.0957	0.0302	0.7504
	Loser (L)	-0.3925	1.2375**	0.1571	0.2559*	0.8082
	W – L	0.3038	-0.1932	-0.0614	-0.2258	0.0643
CVaR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.1749	0.5892**	-0.1281	0.1025	0.7383
	Loser (L)	-0.4579	1.4739**	0.4497**	0.3284**	0.8873
	W – L	0.6328	-0.8847**	-0.5779**	-0.2259	0.6696
CVaR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.1887	0.5657**	-0.1222	0.0892	0.7139
	Loser (L)	-0.7810**	1.5448**	0.5892**	0.3184*	0.8625
	W – L	0.9696*	-0.9792**	-0.7114**	-0.2292	0.6568
CVaR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.2187	0.5621**	-0.1150	0.0886	0.7216
	Loser (L)	-0.7602**	1.5755**	0.6597**	0.4131**	0.8760
	W – L	0.9788**	-1.0134**	-0.7747**	-0.3245*	0.6873
STARR(99%)	Winner (W)	0.2116	0.5762**	-0.1088	0.1115	0.7384
	Loser (L)	-0.4920	1.4975**	0.4475**	0.2906*	0.8795
	W – L	0.7036*	-0.9213**	-0.5563**	-0.1790	0.6577
STARR(95%)	Winner (W)	0.2260	0.5592**	-0.1217	0.0969	0.7260
	Loser (L)	-0.7864**	1.5491**	0.6140**	0.3504**	0.8743
	W – L	1.0124**	-0.9899**	-0.7357**	-0.2535	0.6846
STARR(90%)	Winner (W)	0.2307	0.5631**	-0.1235	0.0889	0.7265
	Loser (L)	-0.7197*	1.5706**	0.6603**	0.4263**	0.8713
	W – L	0.9505*	-1.0075**	-0.7838**	-0.3374*	0.6886
R-ratio(99%,99%)	Winner (W)	-0.0609	1.0247**	0.2012**	0.2384**	0.9333
	Loser (L)	0.1324	1.0904**	0.1730*	0.0454	0.9057
	W – L	-0.1933	-0.0657	0.0282	0.1930*	0.0501
R-ratio(95%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.0875	0.9893**	0.1652**	0.1805**	0.9237
	Loser (L)	-0.0113	1.0796**	0.1245	0.0827	0.8846
	W – L	0.0988	-0.0903	0.0407	0.0979	0.0302
R-ratio(90%,90%)	Winner (W)	-0.0036	0.9603**	0.1500*	0.1877**	0.9157
	Loser (L)	-0.2248	1.1007**	0.1067	0.0573	0.8840
	W – L	0.2212	-0.1405*	0.0433	0.1304	0.0553
R-ratio(50%,99%)	Winner (W)	0.1429	0.9883**	0.2234**	0.2171**	0.9107
	Loser (L)	-0.2628	1.0583**	0.2204*	0.1057	0.8786
	W – L	0.4057	-0.0701	0.0030	0.1114	0.0157
R-ratio(50%,95%)	Winner (W)	0.1971	0.9518**	0.1862**	0.1795**	0.9051
	Loser (L)	-0.3787	1.0936**	0.1550	0.0983	0.8619
	W – L	0.5758*	-0.1418*	0.0312	0.0812	0.0389
R-ratio(50%,90%)	Winner (W)	0.1876	0.9459**	0.1847**	0.1904**	0.8980
	Loser (L)	-0.4812**	1.0830**	0.1425	0.0633	0.8737
	W – L	0.6688**	-0.1371*	0.0422	0.1270	0.0395

** 1% significance * 5% significance